

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Cymeyon Hill,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:21-cv-02336-KJM-KJN

ORDER

V.

Liet Bullard, et al.,

Defendants.

In October 2022, this court adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations, dismissing plaintiff Cymeyon Hill’s action against twelve prison officers. Prior Order (Oct. 27, 2022), ECF No. 15. A month later, Hill filed a document comprised of this court’s prior order, with handwritten text rejecting the court’s subject matter jurisdiction and denying consent to the proceedings. *See* Objections, ECF No. 17. This court liberally construes the filing as a motion to reconsider the prior order.

While a court may relieve a party from an order under Rule 60 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for “mistake, inadvertence, fraud, or excusable neglect” or for “any other reason that justifies relief,” Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1), (b)(6), plaintiff does not claim new facts or circumstances exist or otherwise offer a reason justifying relief, *see* E.D. Cal. R. 230(j)(3), (4). “[A] motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if

1 there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” *389 Orange St. Partners v. Arnold*,
2 179 F.3d 656, 665 (9th Cir. 1999). The court **denies plaintiff’s request for reconsideration**.

3 This order resolves ECF No. 17.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: December 5, 2022.

6 

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE